UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,941	03/11/2004	Martha G. Welch	19240.477 US2	8041
	7590 07/21/201 blumbia University	EXAMINER		
399 PARK AVI	ENUE	KOSAR, ANDREW D		
NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com whipusptopairs@wilmerhale.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/799,941	WELCH ET AL.		
=	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ANDREW D. KOSAR	1654		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>afte</u>	Status of Application: after response to interview		
(1) <u>ANDREW D. KOSAR</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Julia Grimes</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: 28 June 2010	Time: <u>11:00</u>			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: potential 103 and 112				
Claims discussed: all, in general				
Prior art documents discussed:  Hollander				
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/Andrew D Kosar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed amendments to the claims which would place the application in condition for allowance. Claim 26, being amended to inflammatory bowel disease, and new claim 32, drawn to treating primary biliary cirrhosis, would be allowable, finding sufficient enablement in the specification as filed. All remaining claims would be cancelled and the restriction would be withdrawn only to the extent 26 and 'new' claim 32 would be rejoined. The examiner indicated that Hollander (attached) would have formed the basis of the obviousness rejection, similar to that which was previously set forth, however it was published 1/03. Applicant's representative requested time to consult with the client/foreign associate. In the interview of 7/17/10, the examiner indicated that dependent claims from 26 and 32 would be entered and that 'inflammatory' would replace 'irritable' in claim 26, as it is the exemplified embodiment of the specification and appeared to be a typographical error, as irritable bowel disease is not a 'real' condition, but rather inflammatory bowel disease or irritable bowel syndrome. To the examiner, it was clear from the specificaiton examples that 'inflammatory' was the correct term. Agreement was reached on allowable subject matter in an interview of 7/17/10.